AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

U.S. Appln. No. 10/626,739

Attorney Docket No.: Q76609

withdrawn all claims except claim 1 from the application. The Examiner's previous indication

that claim 3 was allowed is now moot.1

II. IDS

The Examiner has again indicated that the listing of references in the specification is not

a proper Information Disclosure Statement. However, there is no listing of references in the

specification. Applicants again request clarification from the Examiner in the next Office

action.

III. Claims

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hiyoshi et al. (JP

2002-21519).

July 30, 2002 is the actual publication date of JP 2002-210519. Based on this publication

date, since JP'519 was published less than a year before Applicants' filing date of July 25, 2003,

JP '519 does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Moreover, this publication is Applicants' own work, and thus does not qualify as prior art

under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

The pending application is based on two Japanese Patent Applications, including the

cited JP 2002-210519. The English language Abstract incorrectly lists the second inventor as

"Shigenori Eguchi" instead of correctly listing him as "Shigeki Eguchi".

Thus, JP' 519 and the pending application were derived by the same entities.

¹ In the Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, the Examiner indicated that claim 3 was allowed.

2

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

U.S. Appln. No. 10/626,739

Attorney Docket No.: Q76609

A Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 is being submitted herewith, which attests to the

fact that the JP 2002-210519 has a typographical error, and that the documents were derived by

the same entities

In view of the foregoing, JP '519 should be withdrawn as prior art accordingly. Since no

prior art rejections should remain, claim 1 is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060 Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550 65565 CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 12, 2007

Ellen R. Smith

Registration No. 43,042

Attorney Docket No.: Q76609

3